9/29/73

Dear Paul,

PO Box 658
Claremont
N.H. 03743

It was good to see you for a moment at the recent show in Philadelphia but pressed pace of life here it feels you were lucky to be found. Now must see to a number of urgent matters in the Great Northern Woods, only I just wanted to ask you about the best place to get from the Austin Cottages.

Perhaps some readers might please write to me direct any hints about Post Cards in the Days of Steamers with which I am at present rather concerned. Best, Kenneth Grahame (1859) in Letters & Leaders

I am preparing to give some readings next week at Rockport Institute. What of poems is it best to stress those for the Moorish Boy Hero Hermann? It would help your Counsel which would be appreciated.

Sincerely,
(J Rogers)

Talked to on Phone 12/5/73

Thanks article is great

NUMISMATIC ERROR COLLECTORS OF AMERICA

MEMBER of BOARD of DIRECTORS • Paul Munson, P. O. Box 462, Goodyear, Arizona 85338

July 16, 1982

Roger S. Cohen,Jr.
4720 Montgomery Lane
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dear Roger,

First off, thank you so much for the copy of your Second Edition. That was very thoughtful of you, particularly when I have done nothing to contribute to it for the past several years! It was a pleasant surprise when it arrived, since I had not read the previous Penny-Wise at that moment so was unaware that you were anywhere near publishing! In fact, when I got the April P-W and read the articles on various aspects of Sheldon's rarity scale, that was when I hunted up my still-unopened January P-W. There was enough "disturbing" writing in the March issue, some also referred to in the January, that I was moved to write. I simply could not come up with the time to do in time for the June P-W deadline, but conveniently for me, Doc Lapp had so much material on hand for June that anything he might have had on that controversy, which might ordinarily have been in the June issue, didn't make it. June's issue had nothing of that type. I wrote my half-cent's worth (and as I have mentioned elsewhere, I find 1/2 cents much more interesting than 2-cents) and had it in the mail a few days prior to Doc's deadline for the next P-W. I am strongly in favor of retaining the Sheldon rarity scale exactly as Sheldon presented it...but I won't get on my soapbox about that here or I'll be writing a long time!

You may remember from back when we were corresponding, that I am not the fastest in getting out a letter. That has become even more so in certain ways in 1982, since I have taken on an unrealistic time commitment. However, the goals which were set early this year (in the financial department) are running on schedule, so I am not complaining. We have raised a houseful of teenage girls, but now all are out of the nest, our youngest having started college in Tucson in January. I remember your past, in that you gave up on large cent collecting several years ago at a time when you also had important (i.e., non-hobby) commitments for your finances. And I have high hopes--and plans--to follow in your footsteps, where you later after the heaviest financial years of family raising, returned to coin collecting, and have done it up proud! Yes, this objective is a part of my motivation for being a "workaholic" in 1982. I am active in mint error collecting, though I don't spend thousands; but I do still feel that the "little half sisters" are the most interesting series in U.S. coinage (Heraldic Eagle half dollars a close second), and someday I'll collect the little coppers again! I

do not, however, have a timetable for that one. Still, if I were to come across a nice looking Fine or VF 1804 and had the $$$$ in my pocket, I would consider picking it up even now! As a matter of fact, I did pick up an 1804 (Gilbert #4) last weekend at the NECA Errorama show (technically, NECA and CONE Errorama, as both clubs now cosponsor it). The coin was listed as "double struck in collar," but as you and I both know, "collar" as it is intended there is not accurate. The coin is double-struck with the two strikes only very slightly out of register, not even noticeable on the majority of the coin. But it is also about 5% off-center, so the combination of two errors on the same coin, and above all, an my favorite date of my favorite coin, I found it hard to pass up, depending on price. Natalie Halpern had the coin--she blushed slightly when I mentioned the misnomer "in collar," as she is one of few dealers who does have knowledge of minting methods past and current)--and she made a package-deal price on half a dozen errors, so I now own it. The coin is F-15, maybe stretchable to VF-20 but I doubt it. Still, I like it, and that is the final judge when a collector buys something.

But I have digressed from the point I had in mind at the start of the previous paragraph. It has been a few months since I received your 2nd Edition, and only now I am saying, "thank you," not very mannerly on my part. Well, even though I am slow to write, even though I am "busy," I would have written earlier, but I decided to wait for a reason. You will note that I have enclosed a copy of the July 1982 "NECA Errorscope." If you take a look therein, you will find my "Early U.S. Errors" column, and I wanted to send you that when I wrote to thank you for the book. Regarding your 2nd edition, I saw, I read, I liked! And as I indicated in the "Early..." column, my reasons for writing that column in the first place were to provide entertainment and information on that topic to NECA readers. Your book is one such milestone on that course and deserves to be aired therein. Any further compliments I would write you here would merely repeat my comments in the article.

To digress again, I should mention that Mike Niespodzinski, a Buffalo, NY, errorist who succeeded me a year and a half ago as NECA Errorscope Editor and who will exit after September from that position, wrote me a letter after receiving the copy for that particular "Early..." article. The crux of his letter was that he had long considered getting into half cents, and that my article pushed him over the brink! He was immediately going to order your book (he also asked if the 1804 Gilbert #8 featured was for sale...nope!)

On the long shot chance that you would like to join NECA (I am not pushing), I noted on the NECA application (page 33) that I would be pleased to sponsor your membership.

Well, that's about it for now, Roger, other correspondence to catch up while I have a rare, free evening. Thanks again for sending the 2nd edition, and for writing it. I hope to see you at the Boston ANA.

Sincerely,

Lou

4701 SANGAMORE RD
BETHESDA MD 20816
8/24/82

Paul Manson
P.O. Box 462
Coolgardie Aust 6429

Dear Paul,

Thank you for your very letter + Copy of the NOCA Exonscope. It's always flattering to read such type reviews of my latest efforts. I do believe that you will like the Cobal's book when its finally released for they possess a section on Mint errors. They have photographed one very large Collection of half cent "Errors" which incidentally is just part of the last Half Cent Collection ever put together. Their book should be of considerable interest for a number of reasons too lengthy to go into for now.

As you probably aware I was not at the ANA in Boston. Due to a scheduling conflict the week of the Convention coincided with part of my two weeks at the beach with my New Family. Two Girls aged 5 + 3 I may seem somewhat odd after getting one family of 3 raised I start all over again. It's a quite different from before.

My time at the beach however did result in acquiring two coins photographed in my 2nd Edition. The 1803 #2 Wire Cud ~~(GILBERT 4)~~ and the 1804 #2 Wire Cud (Not in Gilbert) the owner lived about 90 Miles from where we were so I just drove over to see him one day. The Coins you interested I Now have 97 of the 99 Varieties and sub Varieties listed in the 2nd Edition. Just Need 1794 #56 and #66 both are Now only known by one specimen each. My Sheldon large cents are missing only 12 Numberal Varieties but many of the NC's.

Your article in Penny Wise was of course of interest to me and I'm sure you realize that I am a firm believer in Sheldons Rarity scale AS PRESENTED BY SHELDON I have used it in both editions

The Numerous efforts to expand the rarity scale are to me just as much intellectual and not too much intellectual wrutiny. Despite what you wrote it was Walter Breen who first expanded on Sheldons scale in the late 1950's. This was after Sheldon had rejected Breens proposals for "Penny Wheensy" Breen was the author of Dr Judd's rarity scale! If you request also note it was also used for the "Empire" Half Cent ~~booklet~~ pamphlet. which if you will remember we carried on about 10 years ago some correspondence as to its real origin.

I Noted one comment that you made that seemed to me to be a backward step i.e. "Breens research on US Copper is legendary." You bet its legendary some what like "Betty Crocker" write legendary cook books for General Mills! What you may or may not know is that "WALTER BREEN" has become a legend that is used by Coin Hucksters to promote their Merchandise Breen is used unmercifully. The Present Cabal, Yes Cabal, that is Promulgating WALTER BREENS ENCYCLOPEDIA OF US HALF CENTS is using his legendary Name and the Reason to gain their ends which is superceed My book. I'll have a great deal more to say over the When and if the "other book" is released for the General Publics. I have learned a great deal about their effort and what makes it tick. I can confidentially say that their book will say less than mine and that many errors will be Present. The basis this is that Walter Breen Himself has done No research for 20 years!. Their 1962 his work was Considerable Compared to what had come before but since 1962 a great deal more research has been done which if in conflict with his prior Writings he refuses to recognize.

The most glaring example I can think of is the 1796-1803 CENT Book in the National Archives. In his early Writings Breen stated that this record was kept by the Coining Dept of the Mint (Henry Voigt and Adam Eckfeldt) When I was researching it in 1970-71 it was obvious

that the accounts record was kept by the Mint Treasurer and I so stated in the chapter on 1797. Late last year another Archive Researcher found taped inside the cover the following inscription: "Property of Nicho- Wray." As you know he was the Mint Treasurer who preceded Dr. Benjamin Rush Wray died of Yellow Fever in 1797. Despite all this data Walter has refused to change his position!! Thus it is with many other hard facts I state that I will agree that "Breen writes on US Copper is legendary" only if it is recognized that the writing for the most part is a legend and NOT founded on historical fact known at this time.

Sounds hard at times but the sooner that those of us who are interested in accuracy recognized that Breens writings for the most part are bullshit the more we will advance towards known what actually occurred. The article by Ron Guth in the same issue of "Penny Wise" as yours is like a breath of fresh air. Likewise Bill Wakes article on the 1797 Lettered Edge represents another step towards Rational thinking which has suffered from from Breens type of writing in the Past.

I think I'll close now it was good to hear from You and get a chance to get off some ideas.

Sincerely,

Roger

12/31/82

Dear Paul,

WOW!! Do I have a red face. Found the enclosed which I wrote at the beach in response to yours of 7/14 the next day. I have a few items to add:

~~Back~~ Back in November I drove from Phoenix to Las Vegas and saw a sign [← GOODYEAR] 11 I thought I haven't heard from Paul. Now I know why! I had been to a Meeting of accountants in Phoenix and was on my way to Las Vegas to catch a plane. Debbie + I thought We would like to see the Desert in the Winter Sun. Needless to say it rained up to Kingman.

I do have an additional question - What is NLG? after your name. I Presume its Numismatic Literary Guild. I'm Not a Member Mabey Because I Never asked about it. What Can You tell Me.

Sincerely
Roger

NUMISMATIC ERROR COLLECTORS OF AMERICA

MEMBER of BOARD of DIRECTORS • Paul Munson, P. O. Box 462, Goodyear, Arizona 85338

May 24, 1983

Roger S. Cohen, Jr.
4701 Sangamore Road
Bethesda, MD 20816

Dear Roger,

Your letter of last December has remained in my "unfinished business" file, even though it seems to me that I partially did answer it. Did I???

In your letter you inquired about N.L.G., which is indeed Numismatic Literary Guild. You wanted info about it, so here is some. Their Newsletter arrived this week, and it contained their ballot, which consists of a list of the entire membership! Your name is not on it (copy enclosed), so obviously you aren't in it yet. You certainly should be, and it would be my privilege and pleasure to be your sponsor.

Therefore, please write now to NLG's Executive Director, see enclosed, to get the membership application. Dues are $5 per year, as I recall, well worth it. I have also enclosed the membership requirements, which were in this issue as part of one of its articles. You qualify, as an author of a numismatic book. So get with it, Roger, and don't procrastinate. You see, I think I'll write them an article about their election process, and I would be interested in your reaction.

Well, I'm trying to make my letters short right now so I can get through the stack. But I'll put your December letter in the "suspense" file, and let me know if I never answered it. If that is the case, I'll do so...and before 6 months go by!

Sincerely,

Paul

NUMISMATIC ERROR COLLECTORS OF AMERICA

MEMBER of BOARD of DIRECTORS • Paul Munson, P. O. Box 462, Goodyear, Arizona 85338

June 30, 1983

Roger S. Cohen, Jr.
4701 Sangamore Road
Bethesda, MD 20816

Dear Roger,

Neither of us is the world's fastest to reply to letters, and you really didn't need to respond to mine of May 24th, in which I gave you the NLG information. If by chance you didn't get that letter, let me know, and I'll send it again.

My reason for writing this time is back to the "good stuff," half cents. I don't remember whether you are a member of either mint error club, CONE or NECA, or not. If not, I'll mention that the two have merged, so there is only one error club now, CONECA, dues $12.50 per year if you're interested. If you are/were a member of either CONE or NECA, you already know this.

Anyway, I write a column for their publication titled "Early U.S. Errors," although I haven't written it for the past few months, too many other things got in the way. Now I am getting things a little better organized and am getting back to it.

One half cent error in particular has "haunted" me for years, ever since I read Gilbert's comment about the stemless wreath die under his 1806 description (or was it 1804? I don't have my Gilbert book here to recheck) that it sometimes comes with the entire wreath double-cut, or some such. As you and I know, the die was not made/altered/remade with the wreath punched again, instead it is surely a case where Gilbert saw a coin which had the wreath in double, caused by the strike, not by the die doubled. I have never seen the coin he described, have you? I do have, however, an 1804 (if his mention was under 1806, or mine is 1806 if he said this for 1804) example of that stemless die where the entire wreath is in double! I plan to picture this piece and write a CONECA installment in my column featuring it. But I would like your comments, particularly in light of the next paragraph's thoughts.

We "know" the bouncing-die phenomenon, which caused double profiles on several dates of U.S. large cents, also several dates of Turban half dollars. (Some months ago I wrote an article on these double profile coins.) As a separate item, I own a few 1804 half cents with some obverse doublings. Now, on the bouncing-die theory, as the upper ("hammer") die descends in this screw press, if there is a particular type of looseness in the press (can you pin-point this for me?), the die will strike the planchet, causing the start of obverse (upper by this hypothesis) and reverse (lower side of the coin) designs to form. Then because of the looseness,

a slight shift takes place as the hammer die hits with full force, this shift being observed on the obverse (upper) side of the coin, the "accepted" explanation being that this is where the shifting actually takes place, while there is no motion between the reverse of the coin and the anvil (lower) die. Therefore, the resulting coin shows probably a double-profile, perhaps some evidence of other doubling on that side of the coin but usually not, again the explanation being that only the highest points of the die make impression on the planchet before the shift, these highest points being the outline (actually, certain parts of the outline) of the figure of Miss Liberty. First off, do you buy this explanation? Secondly, how would this explain a doubled-reverse coin???

Just today as I was thinking about this coin, I got a brainstorm, which I'll run past you. What if, for at least a short time, at least a small number of half cent strikes, the obverse die was the anvil (lower) and the reverse die was the hammer (upper)??? I say, again using the above as the explanation for how these come about, that this situation would permit creation of one-sided double-strikes, but now with the reverse being doubled! And if so, this might have occurred, creating my 1804 Gilbert #2 (your #13?) which I own and which has doubled wreath! And conceivably, the same thing could have occurred with this same reverse die in combination with the 1806 obverse die. Furthermore, since as I recall, die deterioration indicates that some 1804's were actually struck after some 1806's using this reverse die in common, possibly my 1804 and the 1806 which Gilbert mentioned may have been struck at about the same time, on that screw press which had the looseness. The mint worker installed the obverse die on the bottom, reverse die on top, struck some coins including at least one with doubled wreath. Then he replaced the lower die, changing between the 1804 and 1806 obverse dies, and struck more coins, including at least one with the doubled wreath. ...I realize that I am reaching, but I just don't have a good explanation until this one. I would appreciate any comments you might have.

SECOND TOPIC - but related. I came to the above speculation from this one. Recall the 1804 Gilbert #7 half cent, the most common of the spike chin pieces (I still haven't bothered to learn your numbers, but I presume that you "speak both languages from memory," yours and Gilbert's.) In its early use it is uncracked on the obverse die; later crack at LIBER but only a crack; later that crack has seen the die piece move, causing a slightly pivoted "retained cud," as we say in error jargon; still later that die piece broke away and presumably left, these coins now having the full break at LIBE. Well, I have read error articles (on "modern" error coins, that is) about the "retained cud," a situation in which the broken die piece is still present but detached from the main die, such that struck coins show that the planchet was struck by this piece of die as well as the rest of the die, but in this broken die area, the coin's relief is higher. I think you know what I mean, but if not, ask and I'll go into detail, also send coins if need be. Well anyhow, in the literature it has been stated that only anvil dies could create a retained cud, since an actual broken die piece in a hammer die would have nothing to constrain it, and it would fall completely away. I recall one article featuring nickel 3¢ (I think) with obverse retained-cud, indicating that some nickel 3¢ coins had

the obverse die as anvil, reverse as hammer. Seems to me that we have other evidence to support this, that some nickel 3¢ pieces had obverse die as anvil, but I don't remember exactly. I know that some Mercury dimes in the '40's had the obverse die on the bottom. I have read this before, and a few months ago I bought a 1944 (I think) Mercury which was what we call a "wrong-way" partial collar. A partial collar error is a coin for which the collar die was somehow constrained from totally enclosing the coin during strike, so only part of the coin is struck within the collar, the rest free to expand, the result being a partial collar error. Since the collar die comes up from surrounding the anvil die, then obviously a partial-collar error would have the collared portion on the anvil die side, the expanded portion on the hammer die side. Since the obverse die is customarily the hammer, then partial-collar coins have the obverse side showing the expanded metal, the reverse side evidencing a collar strike. A "wrong-way" partial collar has instead the obverse side being struck in collar, reverse side with the expanded metal. That is the case for the dime I am referring to. (All of this is for modern strikes, close collar.)

I have read somewhere in the earlyU.S. minting literature that sometimes when a die broke, the mint worker would "sweat" a collar around the die, holding the two pieces together, and more coins could then be struck before discarding that die, such coins surely showing the indications of (at least) a die crack at the juncture of the two die pieces. Well, this had been my explanation for the retained-cud 1804 Gilbert-7 up to now, and any other "early" retained cuds. But now I am wondering is perhaps the retained cud is even back then similar to now. Do you know how much tolerance there was between the diameter of the collar and the diameter of the struck half cent ("open" collar period)? Comments???

THIRD TOPIC - 1825 half cent with "collar pinch," or "edge pinch." You and I have talked about this one before, but with no conclusive results, right? Way back in the mid-1960's I mentioned to Jim Johnson, the comment finding its way into one of his Coin World Fair-to-Very-Fine columns, that the 1825 half cent had what has now been labeled in mint error jargon as a collar cud. I recall that you and I talked about this one the first time we actually met, when you bought my collection. Both of us had noticed that edge bump, and I indicated that it always is in close proximity to 12th star on obverse, whereas the coin comes with many orientations of obverse to reverse rotation. I had explained this to my satisfaction some years earlier that there was a small break in the collar, into which that metal flowed, producing that lump. No problem...until Dr. Stan West, with whom I carried on quite some correspondence for a couple years in the 1960's, pointed out that 1825 was prior to steam presses, and presumably prior to close-collars. On this one I am still at a loss to explain, can you? From your 1825 coins, can you state conclusively that the were or were not struck in a "close" collar? Do you have any with "wire rim"? The wire rim is possible only with close collar.

Well, Roger, that should keep your brain working awhile. I have many subjects for my future columns, and some may be worthy of Penny-Wise, or both. But the unanswered ones still "haunt" me. How about you???

Yours sincerely,

Paul